

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Thirteen (13) claims (Claims 1 – 13) remain pending in the application through this Amendment. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 9, and 13 have been amended by the amendment filed herewith. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that the subject matter of claims 4 – 13 is allowable. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing the subject matter as being allowable.

Claim Objection

Claim 1 is objected to because of informalities. Claim 1 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner to overcome the objection. The Applicant believes that the grounds for this objection have been obviated.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner states that claims 3 and 4 recite terms that have insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to remove any potential antecedent basis problems. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Request for Information

In response to the Examiner's request for any reference(s) known to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or § 103, the Applicant is filing herewith an IDS citing references recently uncovered in an international search and a counterpart foreign application.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Arnold et al.

Claims 1 - 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,787,818 to Arnold, et al. (hereinafter *Arnold*). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, “shared system registers, each register including one or more bits defining an access protocol, and one or more bits representing data”. Although *Arnold* describes access scheduling for data transfer, *Arnold* does not teach a shared system register having one or more bits that define an access protocol, as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, *Arnold* discloses channel module administration registers that are capable of being directly accessed by the processor modules to enable the processor modules to setup transfers of blocks of data. The channel modules then use the administration registers to schedule individual word transfers of the blocks of data independently of the processor module. There is no discussion in *Arnold* of any shared registers that include one or more bits that define an access protocol and one or more bits that represent data, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner refers to the processor module registers (PRS) shown in Fig. 2 of *Arnold* as corresponding to the “shared system registers” recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. The Examiner refers to the processing modules/CPU's A - C shown in Fig. 1 as corresponding to the “N processors” recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. As noted by the Examiner, the PRS registers are inside of the processors, as shown in Fig. 2. Fig. 2 illustrates a single one of the processor modules, labeled PM, within which the PRS are located. Col. 3, lines 64 – 68, reads “[t]he processor module PM includes a parallel internal highway MHW by way of which manipulated data is circulated between the processor registers PRS and the arithmetic unit AU.”

It is clear from this language that the PRS are only used by elements of the processor module within which the PRS are located; the PRS are not shared by the processor modules. For example, the PRS located in CPU A are not accessed by the PRS located in CPU B. Therefore, the PRS are not “shared” by

two or more processor modules. Claim 1 of the present application recites “N processors” ... “each accessing the registers”. This feature of the invention is not taught or suggested by *Arnold*.

For all of these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over *Arnold* and the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn. For at least the reason that dependent claims 2 and 3 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and therefore incorporate the elements of claim 1, claims 2 and 3 also are patentable over *Arnold*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and the Applicants request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should there be any further questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,
GARDNER GROFF SANTOS
& GREENWALD, P.C.

/Daniel J. Santos/
Daniel J. Santos, Reg. No. 40,158

GARDNER GROFF SANTOS
& GREENWALD, P.C.
2018 Powers Ferry Road, Suite 800
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
Phone: 770.984.2300
Fax: 770.984.0098